



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,154	11/12/2003	Erol Bozak	09700.0033-00	8247
22852 7590 11/13/2007 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			EXAMINER KISS, ERIC B	
			ART UNIT 2192	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/13/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/712,154

Applicant(s)

BOZAK ET AL.

Examiner

Eric B. Kiss

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20070614</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The reply filed August 28, 2007, has been received and entered. Claims 1-7 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4-7 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 4, the examiner maintains that *Kurowski et al.* discloses a second computer configured to execute a service (see, e.g., paragraph [0061] (client receives a task from the task server); paragraph [0092] (application modules are downloaded)), wherein the service, upon request from the first application manager, installs and executes a first application (see, e.g., paragraphs [0156], [0259] (settings and state are stored in files), [0156] (a part of the memory is allocated to the application)). The client machine of *Kurowski et al.* is a "second computer", and the self-extracting EXE of *Kurowski et al.* (automatically installing the client on user's machine) invokes the installation "service" on the client machine.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement filed June 14, 2007, fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because each publication listed in an information disclosure statement must be identified by publisher, author (if any), title, relevant pages of the publication, date, and place of publication. 37 CFR 1.98(b)(5). They have been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits, except as initialed by the examiner. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-

Art Unit: 2192

submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 1-3 rely on the labels “inferior” and “superior” in describing a hierarchical network of computers. The specification appears to describe these features only in terms of a proposed hierarchical relationship between grid managers, where these relationships somehow provide indirect access to other computers (Specification para. [0026]), and that lists of inferior/superior relations are stored (*id.* at para. [0027]). Further, Fig. 1 is purported to illustrate inferior/superior relations (Specification at [para. [0026] (grid manager 152 has a superior relation with grid managers 154 and 156)). However, the original disclosure (including the original drawings and claims) omits certain information necessary to carry out the claimed invention: (1) the definition of an inferior or superior computer, (2) the relevant configurations of each of the inferior or superior computers, and (3) the necessary steps to configure a computer as

Art Unit: 2192

an inferior or superior computer. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been able to practice the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As discussed above with regard to the rejection under § 112, first paragraph, the terms “inferior” and “superior” are not clearly defined in the original disclosure. The terms “inferior” and “superior” are not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a definition or other standard for ascertaining the qualities of an inferior or superior computer, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-3 are indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0019844 (Kurowski et al.).

As per claim 4, *Kurowski et al.* discloses a network comprising:

a first computer configured to execute a first application manager that manages a first application (see, e.g., paragraph [0061] (client receives a task from the task server)); and

a second computer configured to execute a service (see, e.g., paragraph [0061] (client receives a task from the task server); paragraph [0092] (application modules are downloaded)), wherein the service, upon request from the first application manager, installs and executes a first application by making modifications to the second computer to install and execute the first application on the second computer (see, e.g., paragraph [0156]) while recording the modifications (see, e.g., paragraph [0259] (settings and state are stored in files)), wherein the modifications comprise allocating a resource to the first application manager (see, e.g., paragraph [0156] (a part of the memory is allocated to the application)).

As per claim 5, *Kurowski et al.* further discloses the service, upon request from the first application manager, being configured to:

halt the first application on the second computer (see, e.g., paragraph [0147]);

reverse a portion of the modifications to the second computer according to the recorded modifications, reversing comprises deallocating the resource from the first application manager (see, e.g., paragraph [0157]); and

make re-modifications to the second computer to install and execute a second application on the second computer while recording the re-modifications, wherein the re-modifications comprise allocating the resource to a second application manager (see, e.g., paragraph [0158]).

As per claim 6, *Kurowski et al.* further discloses the re-modifications comprising at least one of setting a communications port or saving the one or more files to a data storage device

accessible to the second computer (see, e.g., paragraph [0156] (saving the files making up the application to the local hard disk of the client computer)).

As per claim 7, *Kurowski et al.* further discloses the first and second applications having a respective type and the network is further configured to:

compare the second application type to the first application type and to the at least one other application type (see, e.g., paragraphs [0154] and [0158] (a locally cached version of the computation module is used if available)); and

if at second application has the same type as either the first application or the at least one other application, reverse a portion of the modifications and allocating the resource without re-modifying the second computer to install and execute the second application (see, e.g., paragraphs [0154] and [0158] (a locally cached version of the computation module is used if available)).

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Eric B. Kiss whose telephone number is (571) 272-3699. The Examiner can normally be reached on Tue. - Fri., 7:00 am - 4:30 pm. The Examiner can also be reached on alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam, can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2192

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry of a general nature should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist:
571-272-2100.



Eric B. Kiss
November 12, 2007